



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/750,003

12/30/2003

Ingo Zenz

6570P016

9941

45062

7590

07/21/2008

SAP/BSTZ

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY

SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER

MORRISON, JAY A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2168

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/21/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/750,003	Applicant(s) ZENZ, INGO	
	Examiner JAY A. MORRISON	Art Unit 2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-10,16-21,23-26 and 28-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-10,16-21,23-26 and 28-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/24/08</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Reopen Prosecution

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 4/22/2008, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

If an appellant wishes to reinstate an appeal after prosecution is reopened, appellant must file a new notice of appeal in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31 and a complete new appeal brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37. Any previously paid appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 for filing a notice of appeal, filing an appeal brief, and requesting an oral hearing (if applicable) will be applied to the new appeal on the same application as long as a final Board decision has not been made on the prior appeal. If, however, the appeal fees have increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the current fee(s) and the amount previously paid. Appellant must file a complete new appeal brief in compliance with the format and content requirements of 37 CFR 41.37(c) within two months from the date of filing the new notice of appeal. See MPEP § 1205.

Remarks

2. Claims 1-6, 8-10, 16-21, 23-26 and 28-31 are pending.

Specification

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The term "machine-readable medium" as claimed is not defined in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. These claims disclose a system or apparatus but do not describe hardware which executes each of the claimed steps, which is required for a system claim to be statutory. Accordingly, these claims are rejected as non-statutory for failing to disclose such hardware.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 19 recites the limitation "the component" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is unclear which component is being referenced here since there is more than one component introduced previously in the claim, meaning that "the component" lacks clear antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Patrizio et al. ('Patrizio' hereinafter) (Patent Number 7,047,497) in view of Slaughter et al. ('Slaughter' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,014,669).

As per claim 29, Patrizio teaches

A system comprising: (see abstract and background)

a central storage node, the central storage node including a configuration data structure, the configuration data structure comprising a global configuration module and a sub-cluster configuration module. (hierarchical map of objects including clusters node and interrelations, column 3, lines 38-44)

Patrizio does not explicitly indicate “the central storage node to send information included in the configuration data structure to a node within a sub-cluster in response to a request from the node”.

However, Slaughter discloses “the central storage node to send information included in the configuration data structure to a node within a sub-cluster in response to a request from the node” (cluster configuration queries and transfer of information between nodes of cluster, column 3, lines 51-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Patrizio and Slaughter because using the steps of “the central storage node to send information included in the configuration data structure to a node within a sub-cluster in response to a request from the node” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by providing configuration data that is highly available in case of single node crashes. This gives the user the advantage of being assured of cluster reliability.

As per claim 30, Patrizio teaches
the global configuration module comprising a dispatcher configuration module
and a server configuration module. (column 3, lines 35-40)

As per claim 31, Patrizio teaches
the sub-cluster configuration module comprising a local configuration information
associated with a sub-cluster, the local configuration information comprising a

Art Unit: 2168

dispatcher module and a plurality of server modules, the dispatcher module including configuration information associated with a dispatcher node of the sub-cluster, and each of the plurality of server modules including configuration information associated with each server node of the sub-cluster. (column 3, lines 52-62)

10. Claims 1-2 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubert et al. ('Rubert' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,366,915) in view of Patrizio et al. ('Patrizio' hereinafter) (Patent Number 7,047,497) and further in view of Slaughter et al. ('Slaughter' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,014,669).

As per claim 1, Rubert teaches

A property sheet system comprising: (see abstract and background)

"including a plurality of property names, a plurality of non-modifiable parameters and a plurality of modifiable parameters, wherein each respective property name included in the property sheet data structure is associated with a non-modifiable parameter and optionally a modifiable parameter; and a user interface to display contents of the property sheet data structure", "the user interface to receive inputs to select and modify a parameter associated with the property sheet data structure" (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

Rubert does not explicitly indicate "a configuration module representing configuration information of a node within a clustered system, the configuration module

comprising any one of a binary file, the binary file to map a key name to a set of data, a sub-configuration entry comprising an object of the code, or a name-value pair, the name-value pair to map a key name to an object, and a property sheet data structure representing configuration information associated with at least one component within the clustered system”, “to allow centralized management of the clustered system”.

However, Patrizio discloses “a configuration module representing configuration information of a node within a clustered system, the configuration module comprising any one of a binary file, the binary file to map a key name to a set of data, a sub-configuration entry comprising an object of the code, or a name-value pair, the name-value pair to map a key name to an object, and a property sheet data structure representing configuration information associated with at least one component within the clustered system”, “to allow centralized management of the clustered system” (selecting node in cluster where the node table is populated, column 4, lines 30-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Patrizio because using the steps of “a configuration module representing configuration information of a node within a clustered system, the configuration module comprising any one of a binary file, the binary file to map a key name to a set of data, a sub-configuration entry comprising an object of the code, or a name-value pair, the name-value pair to map a key name to an object, and a property sheet data structure representing configuration information associated with at least one component within the clustered system”, “to allow centralized management of the clustered system” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making

information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

Neither Rubert nor Patrizio explicitly indicate “and to manage configuration information of at least one dispatcher node that distributes requests to a plurality of nodes of the clustered system”.

However, Slaughter discloses “and to manage configuration information of at least one dispatcher node that distributes requests to a plurality of nodes of the clustered system” (cluster configuration queries and transfer of information between nodes of cluster, column 3, lines 51-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rubert, Patrizio and Slaughter because using the steps of “and to manage configuration information of at least one dispatcher node that distributes requests to a plurality of nodes of the clustered system” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by providing configuration data that is highly available in case of single node crashes. This gives the user the advantage of being assured of cluster reliability.

As per claim 2,

Rubert does not explicitly indicate “the property sheet data structure is associated with a plurality of components contained within a clustered system”.

However, Patrizio discloses “the property sheet data structure is associated with a plurality of components contained within a clustered system” (column 4, lines 25-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Patrizio because using the steps of “the property sheet data structure is associated with a plurality of components contained within a clustered system” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

As per claim 16, Rubert teaches

A method comprising:” (see abstract and background)

displaying contents of the property sheet, the property sheet including non-modifiable parameters and modifiable parameters; and receiving input to select and modify a parameter of the displayed property sheet (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

Rubert does not explicitly indicate “providing a configuration module of a node contained within a cluster, the module comprising any one of a binary file, a sub-configuration entry, or a name-value pair, and a property sheet containing configuration information associated with a component contained within a cluster”.

However, Patrizio discloses “providing a configuration module of a node contained within a cluster, the module comprising any one of a binary file, a sub-configuration entry, or a name-value pair, and a property sheet containing configuration information associated with a component contained within a cluster” (selecting node in cluster where the node table is populated, column 4, lines 30-50);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Patrizio because using the steps of “providing a configuration module of a node contained within a cluster, the module comprising any one of a binary file, a sub-configuration entry, or a name-value pair, and a property sheet containing configuration information associated with a component contained within a cluster” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

Neither Rubert nor Patrizio does not explicitly indicate “and sending the configuration information to the node in response to a request from the node”.

However, Slaughter discloses “and sending the configuration information to the node in response to a request from the node” (cluster configuration queries and transfer of information between nodes of cluster, column 3, lines 51-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rubert, Patrizio and Slaughter because using the steps of “and sending the configuration information to the node in response to a request from the node” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by providing configuration data that is highly available in case of single node crashes. This gives the user the advantage of being assured of cluster reliability.

As per claim 17, Rubert teaches

the displaying contents of a property sheet comprises: providing a number of entry rows; displaying names of corresponding properties in a first column of each entry row; displaying configuration parameters associated with corresponding properties in a second column of each entry row; and indicating if a configuration parameter displayed in the second column is a default parameter or a custom parameter (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

As per claim 18,

Rubert does not explicitly indicate “the property sheet is included in a configuration data structure containing configuration information associated with the cluster”.

However, Patrizio discloses “the property sheet is included in a configuration data structure containing configuration information associated with the cluster” (column 4, lines 25-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Patrizio because using the steps of “the property sheet is included in a configuration data structure containing configuration information associated with the cluster” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

11. Claims 6 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubert et al. ('Rubert' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,366,915) in view of Gudjonsson et al. ('Gudjonsson' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,564,261) and further in view of Tran et al. ('Tran' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,658,018).

As per claim 6, Rubert teaches

A method comprising: (see abstract and background)

“providing a property sheet”, “the property sheet including a plurality of configuration parameters, each parameter associated with a name, a default parameter and a custom parameter”, “default parameters” (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6);

Rubert does not explicitly indicate “associated with a component contained within a clustered system”, “replacing the component contained within the clustered system; and automatically updating the ... parameters included in the property sheet with a different default parameter with a corresponding property of a replacement component in response to replacing the component”.

However, Gudjonsson discloses “associated with a component contained within a clustered system”, “replacing the component contained within the clustered system; and automatically updating the ... parameters included in the property sheet with a different default parameter with a corresponding property of a replacement component in response to replacing the component” (column 18, lines 24-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Gudjonsson because using the steps of “associated with a component contained within a clustered system”, “replacing the component contained within the clustered system; and automatically updating the ... parameters included in the property sheet with a different default parameter with a corresponding property of a replacement component in response to replacing the component” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

Neither Rubert nor Gudjonsson explicitly indicate “and determining a conflict between each custom parameter included in the property sheet with the different default parameter of the corresponding property of the replacement component.”

However, Tran discloses “and determining a conflict between each custom parameter included in the property sheet with the different default parameter of the corresponding property of the replacement component” (compare replacement attributes to team adapter attributes, column 4, lines 33-38 and column 7, line 65 through column 8, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Gudjonsson and Tran because using the steps of “and determining a conflict between each custom parameter included in the property sheet with the different default parameter of the corresponding property of the replacement component” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by having more control of

Art Unit: 2168

over replacement parameters to help ensure smooth configuration updates. This gives the user the advantage of assurance of better reliability.

As per claim 8, Rubert teaches

determining if a custom parameter included in the property sheet is valid with the replaced component (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

As per claim 9, Rubert teaches

deselecting the custom parameter in response to the custom parameter being not valid with the replaced component (column 6, lines 1-6).

As per claim 10,

Rubert does not explicitly indicate “the cluster includes a plurality of instances”.

However, Gudjonsson discloses “the cluster includes a plurality of instances” (plurality of clusters, column 7, lines 35-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Gudjonsson because using the steps of “the cluster includes a plurality of instances” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

Art Unit: 2168

12. Claims 19 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubert et al. ('Rubert' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,366,915) in view of Gudjonsson et al. ('Gudjonsson' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,564,261) and further in view of Block et al. ('Block' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,983,324) and further in view of Tran et al. ('Tran' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,658,018).

As per claim 19, Rubert teaches

A system comprising: (see abstract and background)

“means for displaying contents of a property sheet”, “the property sheet having a plurality of properties, wherein each of said properties is associated with a property name, a non-modifiable default parameter and a custom parameter; and means for receiving input to select and modify a parameter associated with a property included in the property sheet” (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

Rubert does not explicitly indicate “containing configuration information associated with a component contained within a clustered system”.

However, Gudjonsson discloses “containing configuration information associated with a component contained within a clustered system” (column 18, lines 24-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Gudjonsson because using the steps of “containing configuration information associated with a component contained within a clustered system” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available

and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

Neither Rubert nor Gudjonsson explicitly indicate “and means for selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to replacing a component.”

However, Block discloses “and means for selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to replacing a component” (change cluster resource services and parameter modification, column 7, lines 52-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Gudjonsson and Block because using the steps of “and means for selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to replacing a component” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing reconfiguration without taking a node offline. This gives the user the advantage of having more uptime of resources.

Neither Rubert, Gudjonsson nor Block explicitly indicate “by comparing each default parameter of the component to be replaced with a corresponding default parameter of a replacement component.”

However, Tran discloses “by comparing each default parameter of the component to be replaced with a corresponding default parameter of a replacement component” (compare replacement attributes to team adapter attributes, column 4, lines 33-38 and column 7, line 65 through column 8, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Gudjonsson, Block, and Tran because using the steps of “by comparing each default parameter of the component to be replaced with a corresponding default parameter of a replacement component” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by having more control of over replacement parameters to help ensure smooth configuration updates. This gives the user the advantage of assurance of better reliability.

As per claim 26, Rubert teaches

A machine-readable medium that provides instructions, which when executed by a processor cause the processor to perform operations comprising: (see abstract and background)

“displaying contents of a property sheet data structure”, “the property sheet data structure including a plurality of property names, a plurality of non-modifiable default parameters and a plurality of custom parameters; receiving input to select a custom parameter included in the property sheet data structure; receiving input to modify the selected custom parameter; and storing the modified custom parameter without changing a default parameter corresponding to the modified custom parameter” (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

Rubert does not explicitly indicate “representing configuration information associated with at least one component within a clustered system”.

However, Gudjonsson discloses “representing configuration information associated with at least one component within a clustered system” (column 18, lines 24-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Gudjonsson because using the steps of “representing configuration information associated with at least one component within a clustered system” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

Neither Rubert nor Gudjonsson explicitly indicate “and selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to replacing of a component.”

However, Block discloses “and selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to replacing of a component” (change cluster resource services and parameter modification, column 7, lines 52-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Gudjonsson and Block because using the steps of “and selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to replacing of a component” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing reconfiguration without taking a node offline. This gives the user the advantage of having more uptime of resources.

Neither Rubert, Gudjonsson nor Block explicitly indicate “by comparing each default parameter of the component to be replaced with a corresponding default parameter of a replacement component.”

However, Tran discloses “by comparing each default parameter of the component to be replaced with a corresponding default parameter of a replacement component” (compare replacement attributes to team adapter attributes, column 4, lines 33-38 and column 7, line 65 through column 8, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Gudjonsson, Block, and Tran because using the steps of “by comparing each default parameter of the component to be replaced with a corresponding default parameter of a replacement component” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by having more control of over replacement parameters to help ensure smooth configuration updates. This gives the user the advantage of assurance of better reliability.

13. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubert et al. (‘Rubert’ hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,366,915) in view of Patrizio et al. (‘Patrizio’ hereinafter) (Patent Number 7,047,497) and further in view of Slaughter et al. (‘Slaughter’ hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,014,669) and further in view of Tanner et al. (‘Tanner’ hereinafter) (Publication Number 2005/0114315).

As per claim 3,

Neither Rubert, Patrizio nor Slaughter explicitly indicate “the user interface comprises: a first dialog box to display contents of the property sheet data structure, the first dialog box including a plurality of entry rows, the entry rows including a first column to display names of corresponding properties, a second column to display configuration parameters associated with the corresponding properties and a third column to indicate if the configuration parameters are default or custom parameters; and a second dialog box to receive input to modify a custom parameter”.

However, Tanner discloses “the user interface comprises: a first dialog box to display contents of the property sheet data structure, the first dialog box including a plurality of entry rows, the entry rows including a first column to display names of corresponding properties, a second column to display configuration parameters associated with the corresponding properties and a third column to indicate if the configuration parameters are default or custom parameters; and a second dialog box to receive input to modify a custom parameter” (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Patrizio, Slaughter and Tanner because using the steps of “the user interface comprises: a first dialog box to display contents of the property sheet data structure, the first dialog box including a plurality of entry rows, the entry rows including a first column to display names of corresponding properties, a second column to display configuration parameters associated with the corresponding properties and a third column to indicate if the configuration parameters are default or custom parameters; and a second dialog

Art Unit: 2168

box to receive input to modify a custom parameter” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

As per claim 4,

Neither Rubert, Patrizio nor Slaughter explicitly indicate “the second dialog box further includes a name field to display a name of a corresponding property and a default field to display a default configuration parameter associated with the corresponding property”.

However, Tanner discloses “the second dialog box further includes a name field to display a name of a corresponding property and a default field to display a default configuration parameter associated with the corresponding property” (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Patrizio, Slaughter and Tanner because using the steps of “the second dialog box further includes a name field to display a name of a corresponding property and a default field to display a default configuration parameter associated with the corresponding property” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

As per claim 5,

Neither Rubert, Patrizio nor Slaughter explicitly indicate “the second dialog box further includes a data type field to display the data type associated with corresponding property”.

However, Tanner discloses “the second dialog box further includes a data type field to display the data type associated with corresponding property” (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Patrizio, Slaughter and Tanner because using the steps of “the second dialog box further includes a data type field to display the data type associated with corresponding property” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

14. Claims 20-21,23-25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubert et al. (‘Rubert’ hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,366,915) in view of Gudjonsson et al. (‘Gudjonsson’ hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,564,261) further in view of Block et al. (‘Block’ hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,983,324) and further in view of Tran et al. (‘Tran’ hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,658,018) and further in view of Tanner et al. (‘Tanner’ hereinafter) (Publication Number 2005/0114315).

As per claim 20,

Neither Rubert nor Gudjonsson nor Block explicitly indicate “means for receiving input to select between the default parameter and the custom parameter to be applied to a property included in the property sheet”.

However, Tanner discloses “means for receiving input to select between the default parameter and the custom parameter to be applied to a property included in the property sheet” (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Gudjonsson, Block and Tanner because using the steps of “means for receiving input to select between the default parameter and the custom parameter to be applied to a property included in the property sheet” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

As per claim 21, Rubert teaches

“the means for displaying further comprises: means for indicating if a configuration parameter displayed by the means for displaying is a default parameter or a custom parameter” (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

As per claim 22,

Neither Rubert nor Gudjonsson nor Block explicitly indicate “means for selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to changing of a component”.

However, Tanner discloses “means for selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to changing of a component” (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Gudjonsson, Block and Tanner because using the steps of “means for selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to changing of a component” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

As per claim 23,

Neither Rubert nor Gudjonsson nor Block explicitly indicate “means for automatically updating a default parameter included in the property sheet with a different default parameter associated with a corresponding property of the replaced component”.

However, Tanner discloses “means for automatically updating a default parameter included in the property sheet with a different default parameter associated with a corresponding property of the replaced component” (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Gudjonsson, Block and Tanner because using the steps of “means for automatically updating a default parameter included in the property sheet with a different default parameter associated with a corresponding property of the replaced component” would

Art Unit: 2168

have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

As per claim 24, Rubert teaches

means for determining if a custom parameter included in the property sheet is valid with the replaced component (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

As per claim 25, Rubert teaches

means for deselecting a custom parameter in response to the custom parameter being not valid with the replaced component (column 6, lines 1-6).

As per claim 28, Rubert teaches

determining a custom parameter included in the property sheet data structure is valid with the replaced component (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6);

and deselecting an applied custom parameter in response to the applied custom parameter being not valid with the replaced component (column 6, lines 1-6).

Neither Rubert nor Gudjonsson nor Block explicitly indicate “the operations performed by the processor further comprise: automatically updating a default parameter included in the property sheet data structure with a different default parameter associated with a corresponding property of the replaced component”.

However, Tanner discloses “the operations performed by the processor further comprise: automatically updating a default parameter included in the property sheet data structure with a different default parameter associated with a corresponding property of the replaced component” (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Gudjonsson, Block and Tanner because using the steps of “the operations performed by the processor further comprise: automatically updating a default parameter included in the property sheet data structure with a different default parameter associated with a corresponding property of the replaced component” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed 1-6, 8-10, 16-21, 23-26 and 28-31 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the outstanding 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 29, Applicant argues that Patrizio does not teach “a central storage node” and “a configuration data structure”. It is respectfully submitted that Patrizio teaches a ServiceGuard Manager and the node which it runs on reads on the central storage node, since there is no specific description of what exactly entails this central storage node and it can broadly

Art Unit: 2168

be interpreted as a node which has access to the configuration data. The ServiceGuard Manager product executing is described as follows:

“Referring now to the drawings, and in particular to FIG. 1, there is shown an exemplary top level screen shot of the ServiceGuard Manager product. The left panel shows a tree of clusters, nodes and packages monitored by the MC/ServiceGuard clustering product. The right panel 103 shows a hierarchical map of these objects (clusters, nodes and packages) and how they are interrelated, with a specific focus on the cluster named arabica 105, as highlighted in left panel 101.” (Patrizio, column 3, lines 35-43)

The hierarchical map of objects and the configuration of these objects is shown in figures 2-5 and described in the associated portions of the Detailed Description in Patrizio. For example:

“Referring to FIG. 5, there is shown the Nodes tabbed property sheet pane with no rows selected. A top node table 501 shows the nodes contained within the cluster of focus. The user can select a specific node (click on its row) to populate a lower packages table 502, as shown in FIG. 6. Referring now to FIG. 6, the lower packages table 502a shows the packages configured on the selected node row, i.e., crates in the upper node table 501a. It can be seen that the data presented for the node property sheet tab and the package property sheet tab contain similar data, but presented with a different focus.” (column 3, lines 38-44; figure 1).

This citation clearly describes node configuration for clusters and nodes or subclusters, which reads on the configuration data structure as claimed by the Applicant. Therefore the limitation is clearly taught by Patrizio.

With respect to the outstanding 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 29, Applicant argues that Patrizio in view of Laakkapragada does not teach “the central storage node including a configuration data structure” and “the central storage node to send

information included in the configuration data structure to a node within a sub-cluster in response to a request from the node". It is respectfully submitted that this argument is moot due to the new grounds of rejection.

With respect to the outstanding 35 USC 103 rejection of claims 30 and 31, Applicant argues that Patrizio does not teach "the global configuration module comprising a dispatcher configuration module" (claim 30) and "the dispatcher modules including configuration information associated with a dispatcher node of the sub-cluster" (claim 31). It is respectfully submitted that Patrizio teaches the ServiceGuard Manager (column 3, lines 35-38) as previously discussed, and this manager includes information gathered from each of the various nodes within the cluster, as shown in the following citation:

"The right panel 103 shows a hierarchical map of these objects (clusters, nodes and packages) and how they are interrelated, with a specific focus on the cluster named arabica 105, as highlighted in left panel 101. The right panel or map view 103 shows user-selectable levels of the clusters, nodes and packages in the monitored system. In this exemplary view, arabica 105 has four (4) nodes: decaf 107, jamaica 109, latte 111, and mocha 113. There are also two (2) packages associated with the arabica cluster: informix 115 and oracle 117. The nodes decaf 107, jamaica 109, and latte 111 are connected to the arabica cluster 105, as shown by the lines 119. The node mocha 113, however, is not connected to the cluster." (Patrizio, column 3, lines 39-51)

We can infer from this citation, as allowed in 35 USC 103 analysis, that each of these nodes must dispatch their information to the ServiceGuard Manager, so each of these nodes can be considered the dispatcher node of the sub-cluster with regards to claim 31. With respect to claim 30, these modules for dispatcher configuration would

have to exist in the ServiceGuard Manager in order to receive the data from the various nodes. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Patrizio does teach these limitations.

With respect to the outstanding 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 1, Applicant argues that Rubert in view of Patrizio does not teach “a user interface ... to manage configuration information of at least one dispatcher node that distributes requests to a plurality of nodes of the clustered system”. It is respectfully submitted that arguments regarding these limitations have been shown previously as a ServiceGuard Manager in Patrizio (column 3, lines 35-38) which shows a user interface that manages configuration information (figures 2-5), and the remaining arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

With respect to the outstanding 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 1, Applicant argues that Rubert in view of Patrizio does not teach “the configuration module comprising any one of a binary file, the binary file to map a key name to a set of data, a sub-configuration entry comprising an object of the node, or a name-value pair, the name-value pair to map a key name to an object”. It is respectfully submitted that Patrizio teaches that the configuration data contains the required name-value pair as follows:

“With reference again to FIG. 2, there are two types of tabs within a given property sheet. First, there is just the general list-type structure with key value pairs. This is a simple tabbed dialog pane, as illustrated in FIG. 2. The left hand side of the given property sheet, designated in FIG. 2 by the reference numeral 211 is a component that might be a cluster status or a cluster name or a package name.” (Patrizio, column 3, line 63 through column 4, line 2)

In this citation we notice key value pairs, which are used in the previously discussed ServiceGuard Manager (Patrizio, column 3, lines 35-40). Respectfully, these key value pairs used in the ServiceGuard Manager read on the claimed configuration module comprising one of a group including a name-value pair. Therefore the combination of these references does teach this limitation.

With respect to the outstanding 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 16, Applicant argues that Rubert in view of Patrizio does not teach “the configuration module comprising any one of a binary file, a sub-configuration entry, or a name-value pair”. It is respectfully submitted that Patrizio teaches that the configuration data contains the required name-value pair as follows:

“With reference again to FIG. 2, there are two types of tabs within a given property sheet. First, there is just the general list-type structure with key value pairs. This is a simple tabbed dialog pane, as illustrated in FIG. 2. The left hand side of the given property sheet, designated in FIG. 2 by the reference numeral 211 is a component that might be a cluster status or a cluster name or a package name.” (Patrizio, column 3, line 63 through column 4, line 2)

In this citation we notice key value pairs, which are used in the previously discussed ServiceGuard Manager (Patrizio, column 3, lines 35-40). Respectfully, these key value pairs used in the ServiceGuard Manager read on the claimed configuration module comprising one of a group including a name-value pair. Therefore the combination of these references does teach this limitation.

With respect to the outstanding 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 16, Applicant argues that Rubert in view of Patrizio and further in view of Laakkapragada does not teach “sending the configuration information to the node within the cluster in response to a request from the node”. It is respectfully submitted that the arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

With respect to the outstanding 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 18, Applicant argues that Rubert in view of Patrizio and further in view of Laakkapragada does not teach “the property sheet is included in a configuration data structure containing configuration information associated with the cluster”. It is respectfully submitted that the arguments moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

With respect to the outstanding 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 6, Applicant argues that Rubert in view of Gudjonsson and further in view of Tran does not teach “automatically updating the default parameters included in the property sheet with a different default parameter with a corresponding property of a replacement component” or “automatically updating the default parameters ... with a different default parameter ... of a replacement component in response to replacing the component”. It is respectfully submitted that Gudjonsson discloses the limitation in the following citation:

“Administrative tools allow system administrators to change certain settings of the system, add new users, etc. They are responsible for notifying all components in a cluster of changes to settings that affect them.” (Gudjonsson, column 18, lines 24-28)

Here Gudjonsson teaches notifying the components in a cluster of changes to settings, which reads on the situation claimed where default parameters are updated to different default parameters when there are changes within a cluster. This covers the condition as claimed in this limitation, as the parameters would be updated as disclosed by Gudjonsson. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the combination of references teaches this limitation.

With respect to the outstanding 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 6, Applicant argues that Rubert in view of Gudjonsson and further in view of Tran does not teach “determining a conflict between each custom parameter included in the property sheet with the different default parameter of the corresponding property of the replacement component”. It is respectfully submitted that the following citations from Tran teaches the limitation:

“In block B340, routine 300 compares the current adapter capability value to the team (i.e., maximum) capability value. If the current adapter capability value is greater than the team capability value, then in block B350, the team adapter ID, which corresponds to the primary adapter ID, is set to the current adapter ID. In block B360, the team capability value is set to the current adapter capability value, which essentially designates the most qualified adapter as the primary adapter. If the current adapter capability value is not greater than the team capability value, routine 300 progresses to block B370.” (Tran, column 4, lines 33-38)

Here it is clear that the parameters for the different adapters are compared and the values or parameters of the adapters are updated accordingly, which teaches the limitation.

With respect to the outstanding 35 USC 103 rejection of claims 1 and 16, Applicant argues that Rubert, Gudjonsson and Tran are not analogous prior art. In response to applicant's argument, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Rubert is directed querying a number of databases (abstract), Gudjonsson is directed to servers and clustering (abstract) and Tran is directed to managing the properties of adapters in a network (abstract; column 4, lines 33-38 and column 7, line 65 through column 8, line 4). The Applicant's invention is directed to "[a] property sheet system and method for managing and organizing configuration information for components contained within a clustered environment", and it is therefore respectfully submitted that the cited art is both in the field of Applicant's endeavor and pertinent to the problem with which the endeavor is concerned, since properties in a panel and clustered systems are to what the invention pertains.

With respect to the outstanding 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 19, Applicant argues that Rubert in view of Gudjonsson and further in view of Block and further in view of Tran does not teach "selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to replacing a component by comparing each default parameter of the component to be replaced with a corresponding default parameter of a

Art Unit: 2168

replacement component". It is respectfully submitted that the answer to arguments regarding claim 6 also applies here for substantially the same reasons and therefore the limitation as claimed is taught by the combination of references.

With respect to the outstanding 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 3, Applicant argues that Rubert in view of Patrizio and further in view of Tanner does not teach columns in the manner recited. It is respectfully submitted that Patrizio discloses columns in the following citation:

"A top subnets table 701 presents subnets on the cluster. There are three items of information presented for each row: subnet 703, heartbeat 705, and net mask 707. It is possible for the user to view this data in a different column order, if desired. For example, referring now to FIG. 8, the user switches the order of the second and third columns, i.e., heartbeat 705 and net mask 707, merely by dragging the column header to a different location. In this case, column net mask 707a is dragged from the third column in that row to the second. FIG. 8 shows the column net mask 707a in the process of being dragged. Column heartbeat 705a automatically moves to take the third column position, even before the user has dropped the Column net mask 707a to its final location." (Patrizio, column 4, lines 54-67)

Respectfully, these discloses by Patrizio reads on the dialog boxes and entry rows for configuration of properties as claimed, and therefore the limitations are disclosed by the references.

With respect to the outstanding 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 4, Applicant argues that neither Rubert, Patrizio nor Tanner teach "the second dialog box further includes a name field to display a name of a corresponding property and a default field to display a default configuration parameter associated with the corresponding property"

Art Unit: 2168

and “the second dialog box further includes a data type field to display the data type associated with corresponding property”. It is respectfully submitted that these limitations are taught by the same citation from Patrizio used for claim 3 (column 4, lines 54-67). Here we see that the various configurations are available via a user interface, and various configuration parameters are available through this interface. Respectfully, any differences would readily be apparent to those skilled in the art, as default fields and properties displayed in such an interface would be common.

With respect to the outstanding 35 USC 103 rejection of claims 20-21, Applicant argues that Rubert in view of Gudjonsson and further in view of Block and further in view of Tran and further in view of Tanner does not teach “means for receiving input to select between the default parameter and the custom parameter to be applied to a property included in the property sheet” and “means for indicating if a configuration parameter displayed by the means for displaying is a default parameter or a custom parameter”. It is respectfully submitted that the answer to arguments regarding claims 3 and 4 above apply to these claims as well, and it is therefore respectfully submitted that these claims are taught by the combination of the cited references.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jay A. Morrison whose telephone number is (571) 272-7112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Tim T. Vo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2168

Jay Morrison
TC2100

Tim Vo
TC2100